

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/632,661	08/01/2003	Steven M. Casey	20366-092000	3558	
20350 TOWNSEND	7590 09/12/200 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAM	EXAMINER		
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			TIMBLIN, ROBERT M		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
5.11.11.11.05.00, 0.15.111.5051		2167			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/12/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/632,661		CASEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT TIMBLIN	2167	

	ROBERT TIMBLIN	2167	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	.ED WITHIN TW
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	t prior to the data of filing a brief		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•	
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the company of the compa		be entered and an ex	planation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
/Luke S. Wassum/	/ROBERT TIMBLIN/		
Primary Examiner	Examiner, Art Unit 2167		
Art Unit 2167			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to the final Office Action mailed 7/3/2008, Applicant argues (last paragraph of page 6 of the reply) that the Examiner has given an overly broad and unreasonable interpretation to what is meant by the claimed "object". In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that an "object" as defined by the Applicant is sufficiently described by the Elwahab reference. For example, Applicant supplies reference to their object to define it in part as audio, video, software, emergency alerts, and yother content that comes to the home or can be requested from the network via providers. In particular, Applicant's content objects may merely be software or any content that comes to the home or can be requested from the network via providers. Given this broad definition of a content object, the Examiner submits that the claimed object has been given its due reasonable interpretation in light of the reference. For in the example of Ewahab, a user transmits and receives information to and from a "smart system". The Examiner submits that the information from the user (e.g. a provider) may be seen as the broadly defined "any other content..." Further noted in the control of the smart devices of the system, and the provider in Elwahab also may communicate with markup pases (i.e. internet objects as seen in present claims 24-25).

For at least these reasons, the finality of the Office Action mailed 7/3/2008 is maintained.